arXiv:1610.01574v1 [math.LO] 5 Oct 2016

SPECIAL ARONSZAJN TREE PROPERTY

MOHAMMAD GOLSHANI AND YAIR HAYUT

Abstract. Assuming the existence of a proper class of supercompact cardinals, we force that for every regular cardinal κ, there are κ^+-Aronszajn trees and all such trees are special.

1. Introduction

Aronszajn trees are of fundamental importance in combinatorial set theory and two of the most interesting problems about them are the problem of their existence (the Tree Property) and the problem of their specialization.

Given a regular cardinal κ, the *Tree Property* at κ is the assertion "there are no κ-Aronszajn trees". By a theorem of König, the tree property holds at $\aleph_0$. By a result of Aronszajn, the tree property fails at $\aleph_1$. The problem of the tree property at higher cardinals is more complicated and is independent of ZFC. An interesting and famous question of Magidor asks if the tree property can hold at all regular cardinals bigger than $\aleph_1$ and though the problem is widely open, there are many works towards its consistency.

Definition 1.1. *A λ^+-Aronszajn tree T on a successor cardinal λ^+ is* special *if there is a function $f\colon T \to \lambda$ such that if $x \leq_T y$ then $f(x) \neq f(y)$.*

The specialization function, f, witnesses the fact that T has no branch. Thus, if T is special then it remains Aronszajn in any larger model of ZFC in which λ^+ is a cardinal.

For an uncountable regular cardinal κ, let SATP(κ), the *Special Aronszajn Tree Property* at κ, be the assertion "there are κ-Aronszajn trees and all such trees are special". By Baumgartner-Malitz-Reinhardt [1], $MA + \neg CH$ implies SATP($\aleph_1$). Laver-Shelah [5] extended this result to get SATP(κ^+), for κ regular, starting from a weakly compact cardinal bigger than κ.

The first author's research has been supported by a grant from IPM (No. 91030417).

In this paper we force the Special Aronszajn Tree Property at many successive cardinals. First we consider the case of forcing the Special Aronszajn Tree Property at both $\aleph_1$ and $\aleph_2$ and prove the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume there exists a weakly compact cardinal. Then there is a generic extension of the universe in which the Special Aronszajn Tree Property holds at both $\aleph_1$ and $\aleph_2$.*

Then we extend the result to consider infinitely many successive cardinals.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume there are infinitely many supercompact cardinals. Then there is a forcing extension in which the Special Aronszajn Tree Property holds at all $\aleph_n$'s, $0 < n < \omega$.*

The above result can be extended to get the Special Aronszajn Tree Property at all $\aleph_{\alpha+n}$'s, where α is any limit ordinal and $1 < n < \omega$. Finally we iterate the proof of Theorem 1.3 to get the following.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume there are class many supercompact cardinals. Then there is a* ZFC*-preserving class forcing extension of the universe in which the Special Aronszajn Tree Property holds at successor of all regular cardinals.*

It is clear that if T is a special κ-Aronszajn tree, then T is not *Suslin*; so the problem of making all κ-Aronszajn trees special is tightly connected to the κ-Suslin hypothesis, which asserts there are no Suslin trees on cardinal κ. Let the *Generalized Suslin Hypothesis* be the assertion "the κ-Suslin hypothesis holds at all uncountable regular cardinals κ". An old question in set theory asks if this statement can be consistent. As a corollary of Theorem 1.4, we obtain the following partial answer to it.

Corollary 1.5. *Assume there are class many supercompact cardinals. Then there is a* ZFC*-preserving class forcing extension of the universe in which the Generalized Suslin Hypothesis holds at successor of all regular cardinals.*

In Section 2 we prove 1.2, in Section 3 we prove 1.3 and finally in Section 4 we prove 1.4.

Out notations are mostly standard. For facts about forcing and large cardinals we refer the reader to [3]. We force downwards and we always assume that our forcing notions are

separative, namely for pair of conditions p, q in a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$, $p \leq q$ means that p is stronger than q and $p \Vdash q \in \dot{G}$ where $\dot{G} = \{\langle p, \check{p}\rangle \mid p \in \mathbb{P}\}$ is the canonical name for the generic filter.

2. Special Aronszajn Tree Property at $\aleph_1$ and $\aleph_2$

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2.

2.1. Baumgartner forcing for specializing $\aleph_1$-Aronszajn trees.

In this subsection we briefly review Baumgartner's forcing for specializing $\aleph_1$-Aronszajn trees.

Definition 2.1. *Let T be an $\aleph_1$-Aronszajn tree. The Baumgartner forcing for specializing T, $\mathbb{B}(T)$, is defined as the set of all partial functions $f : T \to \omega$ such that*

(1) $\mathrm{dom}(f) \subseteq T$ *is finite.*

(2) *If $s, t \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$ and $s <_T t$, then $f(s) \neq f(t)$.*

The order on $\mathbb{B}(T)$ is the reverse inclusion.

Let us state the basic properties of the forcing $\mathbb{B}(T)$.

Lemma 2.2. (a) *$\mathbb{B}(T)$ is c.c.c.*

(b) *In the generic extension by $\mathbb{B}(T)$, the tree T is specialized; in fact if G is $\mathbb{B}(T)$-generic over the ground model V, then $F = \bigcup G$ is a specializing function from T to ω.*

Proof. We sketch the proof for completeness.

(a) We follow [2]. Suppose towards a contradiction that $\mathbb{B}(T)$ has an uncountable antichain A. We can assume, without loss of generality, that the elements of A all have the same size N, and for each $f \in A$ let $\mathrm{dom}(f) = \{t^f_1, \ldots, t^f_N\}$. Furthermore, using the Δ-system lemma, we may assume that there is some r such that for every pair of elements f, g in A, $\mathrm{dom}\, f \cap \mathrm{dom}\, g = r$ and $f \restriction r = g \restriction r$. Note that as A is an antichain, for distinct pairs $f, g \in A$, there exist $k, l < N$ such that t^f_k and t^g_l are compatible in T and $f(t^f_k) = g(t^g_l)$.

Let U be a non-principal uniform ultrafilter on A. Then for each f there exist $k, l < N$ such that

$$A_{f,k,l} = \{g \in A \mid t^f_k \text{ and } t^g_l \text{ are compatible and } f(t^f_k) = g(t^g_l)\} \in U.$$

By narrowing A down, we may assume without loss of generality, that these k, l are the same for each f. Let $f, g \in A$. Then for each $h \in A_{f,k,l} \cap A_{g,k,l}$, t^h_l is compatible with both t^f_k and t^g_k, and since $A_{f,k,l} \cap A_{g,k,l}$ is uncountable, we can find an h as above such that $t^h_l >_T t^f_k,\ t^g_k$. As T is a tree, we have t^f_k and t^g_k are compatible in T. It follows that

$$b = \{s \in T \mid \exists f \in A, s \leq_T t^f_k\}$$

is an uncountable branch in T, a contradiction to the assumption that T is Aronszajn.

(b) Is easy, and follows by simple density arguments. □

Definition 2.3. *Let V be the ground model. Baumgartner's forcing for specializing all $\aleph_1$-Aronszajn trees, $\mathbb{P}$, is defined as the finite support iteration*

$$\mathbb{P} = \langle\langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha \mid \alpha \leq 2^{\aleph_1}\rangle, \langle \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha \mid \alpha < 2^{\aleph_1}\rangle\rangle$$

of forcing notions where

1. *For each $\alpha < 2^{\aleph_1}, \Vdash_\alpha$ "$\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha = \mathbb{B}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$", for some $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name $\dot{T}_\alpha$ which is forced by $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ to be an $\aleph_1$-Aronszajn tree.*
2. *If $\dot{T}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-name for an $\aleph_1$-Aronszajn tree, then for some $\alpha < 2^{\aleph_1}, \dot{T}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name and $\Vdash_\alpha$ "$\dot{T} = \dot{T}_\alpha$".*

Let us mention some basic properties of $\mathbb{P}$.

Lemma 2.4. (a) *$\mathbb{P}$ is c.c.c.*

(b) *In the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}, 2^{\aleph_0} = (2^{\aleph_1})^V$ and all $\aleph_1$-Aronszajn trees are specialized.*

Proof. (a) Follows from 3.17(a) and the Solovay-Tennenbaum theorem that the finite support iteration of c.c.c. forcing notions is c.c.c.

(b) Follows from 3.17(b) and 2.3(2). □

2.2. **Specializing names for $\aleph_2$-Aronszajn trees.** In this section we define a forcing notion for specializing names of $\aleph_2$-Aronszajn trees.

Definition 2.5. *Let V be the ground model, κ be an inaccessible cardinal in V and suppose that $\mathbb{P} * \dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a two step iteration forcing which is κ-c.c. and makes $\kappa = \aleph_2$. Let $\dot{T}$ be a*

$\mathbb{P} * \dot{\mathbb{Q}}$-name for a κ-Aronszajn tree. We may assume that $\dot{T}$ is forced to be a tree on $\kappa \times \omega_1$ and that the α-th level of it is forced to be $\{\alpha\} \times \omega_1$. Let $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\dot{T})$ be the following forcing notion as it is defined in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$:

Conditions in $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\dot{T})$ are partial functions $f : \kappa \times \omega_1 \to \omega_1$ such that:

(1) *$\mathrm{dom}(f) \subseteq \kappa \times \omega_1$ is countable.*

(2) *If $s, t \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$ and $f(s) = f(t)$ then $\Vdash^{V^{\mathbb{P}}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\check{s} \perp_{\dot{T}} \check{t}''$.*

The ordering is reverse inclusion.

Lemma 2.6. *Work in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$.*

(a) *The forcing notion $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\dot{T})$ is $\aleph_1$-closed.*

(b) *In the generic extension by $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\dot{T})$, there is a function $F : \kappa \times \omega_1 \to \omega_1$ which is a specializing function in all further generic extensions by $\mathbb{Q}$.*

In general, $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\dot{T})$ may fail to satisfy the κ-c.c. As we will see later, in our case for the proof of 1.2, $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\dot{T})$ will satisfy the κ-c.c., which is the crucial part of the argument.

2.3. **Definition of the main forcing.** In this section we define our main forcing notion, which will be used in the proof of 1.2. Assume GCH holds and let κ be a weakly compact cardinal.

We define countable support iteration

$$\langle \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha \mid \alpha \leq \kappa^+ \rangle, \langle \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa^+ \rangle \rangle$$

together with another sequence

$$\langle \mathbb{B}_\alpha \mid 0 < \alpha \leq \kappa^+ \rangle$$

of forcing notions and two sequences

$$\langle \dot{T}^1_\alpha \mid 0 < \alpha < \kappa^+ \rangle, \langle \dot{T}^2_\alpha \mid 0 < \alpha < \kappa^+ \rangle$$

of names for trees, where $\dot{T}^1_\alpha$ is a name for an Aronszajn tree on ω_1 and $\dot{T}^2_\alpha$ is a name for an Aronszajn tree on κ, in such a way that

(1) $\mathbb{P}_0 = \{1_{\mathbb{P}_0}\}$ is the trivial forcing notion.

(2) For each $\alpha < \kappa^+, \mathbb{P}_{\alpha+1} = \mathbb{P}_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha$.

(3) $\mathbb{Q}_0 = \mathrm{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa)$.

(4) For all $\alpha < \kappa^+$, $\mathbb{B}_{\alpha+1} = \mathbb{B}_\alpha * \mathbb{B}(\dot{T}^1_\alpha)$.

(5) For $\alpha \leq \kappa^+$ limit, $\mathbb{B}_\alpha$ is the direct limit of $\mathbb{B}_\beta$, $\beta < \alpha$.

(6) Each $\dot{T}^2_\alpha$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha * \mathbb{B}_\alpha$-name for a κ-Aronszajn tree. Each $\dot{T}^1_\alpha$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha * \mathbb{B}_\alpha$-name for an ω_1-Aronszajn tree.

(7) $\Vdash_\alpha$"$\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha = \dot{\mathbb{B}}_{\mathbb{B}_\alpha}(\dot{T}^2_\alpha)$".

(8) If $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+} * \dot{\mathbb{B}}_{\kappa^+}$ forces that $\dot{T}$ is a κ-Aronszajn tree, then for some $\alpha < \kappa^+$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{B}}_\alpha}$"$\dot{T} = \dot{T}^2_\alpha$". Similarly, if $\dot{T}$ is a name for a ω_1-Aronszajn tree then for some $\alpha < \kappa^+$, $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{B}}_\alpha} \dot{T} = \dot{T}^1_\alpha$.

Remark 2.7. *As we will see in 2.9, the forcing $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$, and hence $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+} * \dot{\mathbb{B}}_{\kappa^+}$ satisfies the κ-c.c. This allows us, using a suitable bookkeeping, to arrange the forcing construction to satisfy clause 8 above.*

It is important to note that although $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$ and $\mathbb{B}_{\kappa^+}$ are defined recursively together, $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$ does not depend on the generic filter of $\mathbb{B}_{\kappa^+}$ and it specializes any possible $\mathbb{B}_{\kappa^+}$-name for an Aronszajn tree, regardless of whether this tree happened to be special or non-special in the generic extension by $\mathbb{B}_{\kappa^+}$.

2.4. **Basic properties of $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$.** In this section we present the basic properties of our forcing notion $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$. The next lemma is clear.

Lemma 2.8. *$\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$ is $\aleph_1$-closed.*

Using the closure of $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$, we may restrict ourselves to a dense subset in which every condition is a countable set of elements from the ground model (and not merely a name).

We now prove the following lemma which is the main step towards completing the proof of 1.2.

Lemma 2.9. *$\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+}$ satisfies the κ-c.c. and even the κ-Knaster property.*

The rest of this subsection is devoted to the proof of the above lemma. The proof consists of two steps. First, we will show that for every κ-Aronszajn tree, T, that appears in the iteration, for many $\alpha < \kappa$, the relation between elements above the α-th level of T and elements below the α-th level of the tree is undetermined by the restriction of the forcing

to V_α. From this we will conclude that for every condition p, for many $\alpha < \kappa$ there are extensions of p into two stronger conditions p', p'' such that the restriction of p' and p'' to V_α is the same and for every element t in the domain of p' or p'' above α, p' forces that $\sigma' \leq t$, p'' forces that $\sigma'' \leq t$ and σ', σ'' are incompatible. Those witnesses, σ', σ'', will depend also on $\mathbb{B}_{\kappa^+}$.

The second step is, given a sequence of κ many conditions in $\mathbb{P}$, $\langle p_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$, to extend each p_i to a pair p_i', p_i'' as above and then, using a Δ-system argument, to fix the incompatibility witnesses in some diagonal way. Then, we will show that every p_i and p_j are compatible and in fact $p_i' \cup p_j''$ is a condition.

The proof imitates the proof of Laver-Shelah's theorem for specializing all ω_2-trees, [5], but with one additional difficulty - the separating pairs in our construction deal also with the conditions in $\mathbb{B}_{\kappa^+}$.

Let us now return to the course of the proof. Recall that κ is a weakly compact cardinal, so let $\mathcal{F}$ be the weakly compact filter on κ. Recall that if $A \subseteq V_\kappa$ and Φ is a Π^1_1-statement, and $\langle V_\kappa, A, \in \rangle \models \Phi$ then the set $\{\lambda < \kappa \mid \langle V_\lambda, A \cap V_\lambda, \in \rangle \models \Phi\}$ is in $\mathcal{F}$. $\mathcal{F}$ is κ-complete and normal.

We prove by induction on α that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ satisfies the κ-Knaster property. It is clear that $\mathbb{P}_1 \simeq \mathrm{Col}(\aleph_1, < \kappa)$ is κ-Knaster. Now suppose that $\alpha \leq \kappa^+$ and each $\mathbb{P}_\beta, \beta < \alpha$, is κ-Knaster. We show that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is also κ-Knaster. For simplicity of notations, we will first assume that $\alpha \leq \kappa$. At the end of the proof we will explain how to extend the arguments for the general case.

The main technical tool is the following separation claim.

Claim 2.10. *Assume $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is κ-c.c. Then there exists a measure one set $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for every $\lambda \in A$, if θ, τ are elements in T_α of level greater of equal to λ and $p \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$, then for every q', q'' with $p = q' \cap V_\lambda = q'' \cap V_\lambda$ there are $p', p'' \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ and a countable sequence $\langle (b_n, \theta_n, \tau_n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$ such that:*

(1) *$p' \leq q'$, $p'' \leq q''$ and $p' \cap V_\lambda = p'' \cap V_\lambda$.*

(2) *$b_n \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$.*

(3) *$\theta_n, \tau_n \in \lambda \times \omega_1$ and $\theta_n \neq \tau_n$.*

(4) $(b_n, p') \Vdash$ " $\check{\tau_n} \leq_{\dot{T}_\alpha} \check{\tau}$ " *and* $(b_n, p'') \Vdash$ " $\check{\theta_n} \leq_{\dot{T}_\alpha} \check{\theta}$ ".

(5) $\{b_n \mid n < \omega\}$ *is a maximal antichain in* $\mathbb{B}_\alpha$.

Notation 2.11. *For forcing notions* $\mathbb{P}$ *and* $\mathbb{Q}$*, we use* $\mathbb{P} \lessdot \mathbb{Q}$ *to mean that* $\mathbb{P}$ *is a regular sub-forcing of* $\mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. By the hypothesis of the lemma, $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has the κ-c.c. and therefore by a Π^1_1-reflection argument and using our choice of $\dot{T}_\alpha$, the set

$$\{\lambda < \kappa \mid \mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda \lessdot \mathbb{P}_\alpha \text{ and it forces } \dot{T}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda \text{ is a } \mathbb{B}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda\text{-name for a } \lambda\text{-Aronszajn tree}\}$$

is in $\mathcal{F}$. Call this set A. We show that A is as required. Suppose that $\lambda \in A$. Let θ, τ be elements in T_α in level greater of equal to λ and let p be a condition in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$.

The branches in $T_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$ below θ and below τ are both new (relative to the forcing $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$). Hence it is forced that in $V^{\mathbb{B}_\alpha}$ there are densely many pairs of conditions (p'_0, p''_0) in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha / \mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$ such that p'_0, p''_0 force incompatible values for the branches below θ and τ and $p'_0 \cap V_\lambda = p''_0 \cap V_\lambda$. Pick $b_0 \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$ such that b_0 decides the values of these two conditions below the pair q', q'' and the elements $\theta_0, \tau_0 \in \lambda \times \omega_1$ which witness the incompatibility.

If every condition in $\mathbb{B}_\alpha$ forces that those two conditions witness the incompatibility of θ and τ, via θ_0 and τ_0, pick any maximal antichain that contains b_0 and halt.

Otherwise, assume that there is a condition in $\mathbb{B}_\alpha$ that forces those two conditions do not witness the incompatibility by θ_0, τ_0. This condition is incompatible with b_0, and we extend it to a condition b_1 that forces a further extension of p'_1 of p'_0 and p''_1 of p''_0 witness the incompatibility of of branches below θ, τ using $\theta_1, \tau_1 \in \lambda \times \omega_1$.

As $\mathbb{B}_\alpha$ is c.c.c., and $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is $\aleph_1$-closed, we can continue this process, which terminates after at most countably many steps. At the end of the process, we get a countable ordinal ϑ, sequences $\langle p'_n \mid n < \vartheta \rangle$ and $\langle p''_n \mid n < \vartheta \rangle$ of conditions in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha / \mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap V_\lambda$, a sequence $\{b_n \mid n < \vartheta\}$ of conditions in $\mathbb{B}_\alpha$ and a sequence $\langle (\theta_n, \tau_n) \mid n < \vartheta \rangle$ such that

- The sequences $\langle p'_n \mid n < \vartheta \rangle$ and $\langle p''_n \mid n < \vartheta \rangle$ are decreasing and $p'_n \cap V_\lambda = p''_n \cap V_\lambda$.
- $\{b_n \mid n < \vartheta\}$ is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{B}_\alpha$.
- For all $n < \vartheta$, $\theta_n, \tau_n \in \lambda \times \omega_1$ and $\theta_n \neq \tau_n$.
- For all $n < \vartheta, (b_n, p'_n) \Vdash$ " $\tau_n \leq_{\dot{T}_\alpha} \tau$" and $(b_n, p''_n) \Vdash$ " $\theta_n \leq_{\dot{T}_\alpha} \theta$".

Let p' extend all $p'_n, n < \vartheta$ and p'' extends all $p''_n, n < \vartheta$. Then p', p'' together with $\langle (b_n, \theta_n, \tau_n) \mid n < \vartheta \rangle$ are as required. □

Let us call the sequence $\langle (b_n, \theta_n, \tau_n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$ a separating witness for θ, τ relative to p', p''. By repeated use of 2.10, for every condition p, we may find a measure one set $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for every $\lambda \in A$ there is a pair of conditions p', p'' extending p, such that $p' \cap V_\lambda = p'' \cap V_\lambda$ and for every $\beta < \alpha$ and any pair of elements above λ in $\operatorname{dom} p'(\beta) \times \operatorname{dom} p''(\beta)$ has a separating witness relative to $p' \restriction \beta, p'' \restriction \beta$. Note that all of the separating witnesses are in V_λ. We call this pair (p', p'') a separating pair.

Let's back to the proof of 2.9.

Let $\langle p_\lambda \mid \lambda < \kappa \rangle$ be a sequence of conditions in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$. By the normality of the filter $\mathcal{F}$, for positive set of $\lambda < \kappa$, we may extend each p_λ to a separating pair $(p'_\lambda, p''_\lambda)$, above λ. Using the normality of the filter $\mathcal{F}$ again, we can assume that on a positive set D, $p'_\lambda \cap V_\lambda = p''_\lambda \cap V_\lambda$ and the separating witnesses are the same for all such λ's; call it $\langle (b_n, \theta_n, \tau_n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$. Narrowing D down, we may assume that for every $\beta < \alpha$, $\{\operatorname{dom} p_\lambda(\beta) \mid \lambda \in D\}$ is a Δ-system, and have the same values of the root of the system. We claim that for any $\lambda < \lambda'$ in D, p_λ is compatible with $p_{\lambda'}$, and moreover it is witnessed by the condition q, which is defined by $q(\beta) = p'_\lambda(\beta) \cup p''_{\lambda'}(\beta)$ for every $\beta < \alpha$. It is enough to show that q is a condition. Clearly, $\operatorname{dom} q$ is at most countable. Therefore, it is enough to show that $q \restriction \gamma$ is a condition for all $\gamma < \alpha$.

We prove it by induction on $\gamma < \alpha$. For $\gamma = 1$, $q(0) \in \operatorname{Col}(\omega_1, < \kappa)$ since it is an union of two conditions that have the same intersection with V_λ and have disjoint domains above it.

Assume that $q \restriction \gamma$ is a condition. We have to show that if $t, t' \in \operatorname{dom}(q(\gamma))$ then $q \restriction \gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\gamma} 1_{\mathbb{B}_\gamma} \Vdash_{\mathbb{B}_\gamma} \check{t} \perp_{T_\gamma} \check{t'}$. If either $t \in V_\lambda$ or $t' \in V_\lambda$ then it follows from the fact that p_λ is a condition or that $p_{\lambda'}$ is a condition. Recall that $(p'_\lambda, p''_\lambda)$ is a separating pair, and thus $p'_\lambda \restriction \gamma \Vdash b_n \Vdash \check{\tau_n} \leq \check{t}$ and $p''_\lambda \restriction \gamma \Vdash b_n \Vdash \check{\theta_n} \leq \check{t'}$, for some $\tau_n \neq \theta_n$. By the induction hypothesis, $q \restriction \gamma$ is a condition. But it forces that b_n forces that t, t' are incompatible in the tree relation. Now if $q \restriction \gamma \nVdash$ " $\Vdash_{\mathbb{B}_\gamma} \check{t} \perp \check{t'}$", then there is a condition $q' \leq q \restriction \gamma$ and $b \in \mathbb{B}_\gamma$ such that $(q', b) \Vdash \check{t} \leq_{T_\gamma} \check{t'}$. But b is compatible with b_n (for some $n < \omega$) and q' is stronger than q and thus also force that b_n separates t and t' - a contradiction.

Let us now treat the general case. Let $\alpha < \kappa^+$ be any ordinal. Let P be a predicate on V_κ, coding the iteration up to α. Clearly, all the previous arguments (about the existence of separating pairs), go without difficulties to the case in which the language contains an additional predicate. In particular, for every condition $p \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ there is a measure one set of cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$ such that $\langle V_\lambda, \in, P\rangle$ is an elementary submodel of $\langle V_\kappa, \in, P\rangle$ and $P \cap V_\lambda$ codes a regular subforcing of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$.

2.5. **Completing the proof of 1.2.** We show that the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+} * \dot{\mathbb{B}}_{\kappa^+}$ is as required.

- The fact that SATP($\aleph_1$) holds in the extension by $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+} * \dot{\mathbb{B}}_{\kappa^+}$ follows from the definition of $\mathbb{B}_{\kappa^+}$, clause (8) of the definition of main forcing construction and 2.2(b).
- The fact that SATP($\aleph_2$) holds in the extension by $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa^+} * \dot{\mathbb{B}}_{\kappa^+}$ follows from clause (8) of the definition of main forcing construction and 2.6(b).

3. Special Aronszajn Tree Property at ω-many successive cardinals

In this section we prove 1.3.

3.1. **Specializing Aronszajn trees in an indestructible way.** Assume κ is a supercompact cardinal and $\lambda > \kappa$ is a regular cardinal which is κ-closed, namely $\rho^\kappa < \lambda$ for every $\rho < \lambda$ and $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$. Also let $\mu < \kappa$ be regular. We describe a forcing notion for specializing $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$-names for κ-Aronszajn trees which turns κ into the successor of μ, and force $2^\mu = \lambda$. By [4], we can assume that the supercompactness of κ is indestructible under κ-directed closed forcing notions.

Let us recall some of the properties of $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$ that hold in V. Fix a well ordering of $H(\lambda)$, $\lhd$. The model $\langle H(\lambda), \in, \lhd, ...\rangle$ has definable Skolem functions, so for any $X \subseteq H(\lambda)$, we can define $\mathrm{Sk}(X)$, the Skolem-hull of X in $H(\lambda)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For every $r \in \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$, there is $s \in \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$, $s \leq r$, such that if $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(s))$, then s is $\mathcal{A}$-generic. Moreover, we may pick $\mathcal{A}$ to be Π^1_1-elementary relative to $H(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{A} \cap \kappa = \bar{\kappa}$ to be a cardinal and ${}^{<\bar{\kappa}}\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Let $r \in \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$. Let us force with $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$ and let G be a generic filter, containing r. By the indestructibility of κ, there is a λ-supercompact embedding $j \colon V[G] \to$

$M[H]$. Let us look at $j\text{``}G \in M[H]$. $j\text{``}G$ is a $j\text{``}H(\lambda)^V = j(\mathrm{Sk})(j\text{``}\lambda)$-generic filter and $\mathrm{range}(j\text{``}G) = j\text{``}\lambda$. Therefore, $M[H]$ thinks that there is $\tilde{s} \leq j(r)$ such that $\tilde{s}$ is $j(\mathrm{Sk})(\mathrm{range}(\tilde{s}))$-generic. By elementarity, the same holds in $V[G]$. But the conditions (as well as the Skolem functions) belong to the ground model, and thus this condition is in the ground model. For the moreover part, let us just note that these properties hold for $\tilde{s} = j\text{``}G$, and $\mathcal{A} = j\text{``}H(\lambda)^V$, by the closure properties of $M[H]$. □

Let us call a condition in $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$ that satisfies the conclusions of the lemma *self generic*. A condition that satisfies the conclusion of the lemma with respect to the enrichment of the model $H(\lambda)$ with a predicate P (thus, adding Skolem functions), is called P-self generic.

We will use the same terminology also for conditions in $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, \leq \bar{\lambda})$, with the obvious interpretation. The following lemma shows that the self generic conditions behave like a tree in a certain way.

For a condition $r \in \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$ and $\beta < \lambda$, we denote by $r \restriction \beta$ the restriction of the partial function r to $\kappa \times \beta$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let r, s be compatible self generic conditions, $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(r))$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(s))$. Let $\kappa_r = \mathcal{A} \cap \kappa$ and $\kappa_s = \mathcal{B} \cap \kappa$. Assume that $\kappa_r \leq \kappa_s$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$ then $s \restriction (\beta + 1) \leq r \restriction (\beta + 1)$.*

Proof. Since r is $\mathcal{A}$ generic, the β-th coordinate $r(\beta) \colon \kappa \to \beta$, is a surjection from $\kappa_r = \mathcal{A} \cap \kappa$ onto $\mathcal{A} \cap \beta$. Similarly, $s(\beta)$ is a surjection from κ_s onto $\mathcal{B} \cap \beta$. Since r and s are compatible, $r(\beta) \subseteq s(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{A} \cap \beta \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \beta$. Apply the same argument for every $\beta' \in \mathcal{A} \cap \beta$. Since $\mathrm{dom}(r) = \mathcal{A} \cap (\kappa \times \beta)$, we conclude that for every $\gamma \leq \beta$, $r(\gamma) \subseteq s(\gamma)$, as wanted. □

Let us define the required forcing for specializing a $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, {<}\lambda)$-name of a κ-Aronszajn tree. Instead of specialize the tree, we will specialize all bounded branches in this tree. This is essentially the same, since given a specialization function for all elements of the tree, we can define a specialization function for all bounded branches by adding one color and coloring all the bounded branches that does not represent an element in the tree with this new color.

Definition 3.3. *Let $V[G]$ be a generic extension of V by a μ-closed and κ-c.c. forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ which forces "$\kappa = \mu^+$". In $V[G]$ let $\dot{T}$ be a $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)_V$-name for a κ-Aronszajn tree* [1]*. We may assume that the the universe of $\dot{T}$ is forced to be $\kappa \times \mu$ and the α-th level of it is forced to be $\{\alpha\} \times \mu$.*

By the chain condition of $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)$, we may assume that $\dot{T}$ is a $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, \leq \bar{\lambda})_V$-name for some $\bar{\lambda} < \lambda$.

The forcing notion $\mathbb{B}^{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T})$ is defined in $V[G]$ as follows:

Conditions in $\mathbb{B}^{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T})$ are partial functions f such that:

1. *The domain of f consists of pairs $(r, \dot{\theta})$, where $r \in \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, \leq \bar{\lambda})_V$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)$ self-generic condition, $\kappa \times \bar{\lambda}$ intersects the domain of r and r forces "$\dot{\theta}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a (not necessarily cofinal) branch in the tree $\dot{T} \cap \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(r))$".*
2. *The range of f is contained in μ.*
3. *$|\mathrm{dom}(f)| < \mu$.*
4. *(Compatibility condition) If $(r, \dot{\theta}), (r', \dot{\theta}') \in f^{-1}(\xi)$, for some $\xi < \mu$, then one of the following hold:*
   (a) *r is incompatible with r', $r \perp r'$.*
   (b) *r and r' are compatible and $r \cup r' \Vdash$ "the branch $\dot{\theta}$ is incomparable with the branch $\dot{\theta}'$ in $\dot{T}$".*
   (c) *$r \cup r' \Vdash \dot{\theta} = \dot{\theta}'$.*
5. *If $(r, \dot{\theta}), (r', \dot{\theta}') \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$, r is compatible with r' and $r \cup r' \Vdash \dot{\theta} = \dot{\theta}'$, then $f(r, \theta) = f(r', \theta')$.*

The order is reverse inclusion.

Lemma 3.4. *Work in $V[G]$.*

(a) *$\mathbb{B}^{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T})$ is μ-closed.*
(b) *Forcing with $\mathbb{B}^{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T})$ adds a name for a function F which specializes $\dot{T}$ in all further extensions by $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)_V$.*

[1] Thus $\dot{T}$ can be regarded as a $\mathbb{P} \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)$-name over V.

Proof. (a) is clear. Let's prove (b). Let $H * K$ be $\mathbb{B}^{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T}) \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)_V$-generic over $V[G]$. Also let $F = \bigcup H$ be the function added by H. Define $F' : \kappa \times \mu \to \mu$ by:

$$F'(\alpha,\beta) = F(r,\dot{\theta}).$$

for any $r \in K$ such that $r \Vdash$"$\dot{\theta}$ is the branch below (α,β)". Note that by the compatibility conditions, we may pick any $r \in K$ and any $\dot{\theta}$ such that $(r,\dot{\theta}) \in \mathrm{dom}(F)$, and the condition above holds. By the density of the self-generic conditions, there is such a condition in $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,\leq \bar{\lambda})_V$. Since every condition in $\mathbb{B}^{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T})$ can be extended to a condition in which the domain contains the pair $(r,\dot{\theta})$, where r is self generic (by assigning to this pair a fresh color), by density arguments F' is defined on all the elements of $\dot{T}$.

We show that F' is as required. Thus assume $r \in K$ and $r \Vdash^{V[G]}_{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)_V}$ "$(\alpha,\beta) \neq (\alpha',\beta')$ are in $\dot{T}$ and they are comparable". Let $\dot{\theta}$ be a name for the branch below (α,β) and let $\dot{\tau}$ be a name for a branch below (α',β'). Pick $f \in H$ and $r' \leq r$ such that $(r',\dot{\theta}),(r',\dot{\tau}) \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$. By definition of the forcing, we have

$$F'(\alpha,\beta) = f(r',\dot{\theta}) \neq f(r',\dot{\tau}) = F'(\alpha,\beta)$$

from which the result follows immediately. □

We now define an iteration of the above forcing notion.

Definition 3.5. *Let $\lambda > \kappa > \mu$ be regular cardinals, κ indestructible supercompact and λ κ-closed. Let*

$$\langle \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha \mid \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle, \langle \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda \rangle \rangle$$

be the $< \mu$-support iteration of forcing notions, where

1. $\mathbb{Q}_0 = \mathrm{Col}(\mu,<\kappa)$
2. *For each $0 < \alpha < \lambda$, $\Vdash_\alpha$ "$\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha = \mathbb{B}^{\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$", for some $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)$-name $\dot{T}_\alpha$ for a κ-Aronszajn tree.*
3. *If $\dot{T}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\lambda \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)$-name for a κ-Aronszajn tree, then for some $0 < \alpha < \lambda$, $\dot{T}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)$-name and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}$ "$\dot{T} = \dot{T}_\alpha$".*

Let $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_\lambda$.

Remark 3.6. *As we will show shortly, $\mathbb{P}$ satisfies the κ-c.c., so we can manage clause 3 above to hold by a suitable bookkeeping argument.*

Lemma 3.7. *The forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ is κ-Knaster.*

Proof. The proof is to show, by induction on $\alpha \leq \lambda$, that each $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ is κ-Knaster. The main technical tool is the following separation claim.

Claim 3.8. *Assume $\alpha < \lambda$ and let $p, q \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$. Let r be a self generic condition and let $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(r))$. Assume r forces "$\dot\theta, \dot\tau$ are $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-names for branches in $\dot T_\alpha$ with length at least $\mathcal{A} \cap \kappa = \kappa_r$".*

If $p \cap \mathcal{A} = q \cap \mathcal{A}$ then, there are conditions p', q' and elements θ', τ' such that:

(1) *θ', τ' are elements of $\dot T_\alpha$ below level κ_r, $\tau' \neq \theta'$.*

(2) *$(p', r) \Vdash \check\tau' \in \dot\tau$, $(q', r) \Vdash \check\theta' \in \dot\theta$,*

Proof. It is easily seen, using the chain condition of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$, the Π^1_1-reflection of $\mathcal{A}$ and the closure of $\mathcal{A}$ under $< \kappa_r$-sequences, that $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{A}$ is a regular subforcing of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$. Moreover, $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{A}$ forces "$\dot T_\alpha \cap \mathcal{A}$ is an Aronszajn tree", while $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ forces "$\dot T_\alpha \cap \mathcal{A}$ is not an Aronszajn tree". Therefore, any branch in the tree above κ_r is new (relative to the forcing $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{A}$) and every condition in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha / \mathbb{P}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{A}$ can be extended to force information about this branch in two contradictory ways.

Note that by the self genericity of r, the relation between any pair of elements in $\dot T_\alpha \cap \mathcal{A}$ is determine by $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$. □

Note that, in the above claim, one can extend r and still get the same separating pair. We will be interested in the *minimal* separating pairs, which are the separating pairs which are obtained by taking the weakest self-generic condition s weaker than r. It is important to note that s does not need to force that $\dot\theta$ is a branch in the corresponding tree of height $\mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}\, r) \cap \kappa$, but only that it is a branch in the restriction of the tree to $\mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}\, s) \cap \kappa$ and this holds always, since $\dot\theta$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name of sequence of elements in $\dot T_\alpha$, s forces that $\dot T_\alpha \cap \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}\, s)$ is a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name and it is weaker than r which forces $\dot\theta$ to be a branch.

For a pair of conditions $r \leq r'$ we will talk about separating pairs between (r, θ) and (r', θ'), meaning the separating pair for (r, θ) and (r, θ').

Using the μ-closure of $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$, we can extend any condition p to a pair p', p'' such that for every $\gamma \in \mathrm{dom}(p') \cap \mathrm{dom}(p'')$ and every $(r, \dot\theta) \in \mathrm{dom}(p'(\gamma)), (r', \dot\theta') \in \mathrm{dom}(p''(\gamma))$, if $r \parallel r'$, and there is self generic $s \geq r, r'$ such that $p' \cap \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}\, s) \parallel p'' \cap \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}\, s)$ then $p' \restriction \gamma, p'' \restriction \gamma$ separate $(r, \dot\theta), (r', \dot\theta')$ using minimal separating pairs. We call p', p'' a *separating pair* below p.

Let us go back to the proof of the lemma. Let $\langle p_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ be a sequence of conditions in $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$. By a Δ-system argument, we can assume (by narrowing down the sequence if needed) that for every $i < j$, $\mathrm{dom}(p_i) \cap \mathrm{dom}(p_j)$ is a constant set, d, and for all i, $d = \mathrm{dom}(p_i) \cap \sup(d)$. Clearly, if $p_i \restriction d \parallel p_j \restriction d$ then p_i is compatible with p_j.

For every i let $\langle (r^i_{\beta,\xi}, \dot\theta^i_{\beta,\xi}) \mid \xi < \mu_i < \mu \rangle$ enumerate the domain of $p_i(\beta)$. For every $i < j$ let $c(i,j) = \{(\beta, \xi, \xi') \mid \beta \in d,\, r^i_{\beta,\xi} \parallel r^j_{\beta,\xi'}\}$. c obtains at most $2^{<\mu}$ colors. By the weak compactness of κ, there is a homogeneous set of cardinality κ, with fixed color $c_\star$. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that $c(i,j) = c_\star$ for every $i < j < \kappa$.

Since our conditions are self generic, if $r^i_{\beta,\xi} \parallel r^j_{\beta,\xi'}$ then either $r^i_{\beta,\xi} \leq r^j_{\beta,\xi'}$ or $r^i_{\beta,\xi} \geq r^j_{\beta,\xi'}$. We may assume that the direction is constant for every $i < j < \kappa$. We claim that the set $R_{i,j} = \{r^i_{\beta,\xi}, r^j_{\beta,\xi} \mid \xi < \kappa\}$ has a weakest member. Assume that for every $\xi < \xi'$, $r^i_{\beta,\xi} \leq r^j_{\beta,\xi'}$. Ignoring $\xi' = 0$, the conditions $\{r^j_{\beta,\xi} \mid \xi < \kappa\}$ are all compatible and every condition of the form $r^i_{\beta,\xi}$ is stronger than a condition of the form $r^j_{\beta,\xi'}$ for some ξ'. Since the forcing relation is determined by the order relation between the intersection of the corresponding structures and κ, this is a reversed well order. Let $s_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$ be the weakest element that appears in $R_{i,j}$ and let $\kappa_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$ be the intersection of κ with $\mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(s_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}))$.

For every $i < \kappa$, let p'_i, p''_i be a separating pair below p_i. Let us look at the set of witnesses $(\theta^{i,\prime}_{\beta,\xi}, \tau^{i,\prime}_{\beta,\xi'})$ for separating between $(r^i_{\beta,\xi}, \dot\theta^i_{\beta,\xi})$ and $(r^i_{\beta,\xi'}, \dot\theta^i_{\beta,\xi'})$. We claim that these separation points are below $\kappa_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$. This is true, as all those conditions are also generic relative to $\mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(s_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}))$. Therefore, they force the restriction of $\dot T_\alpha$ to this set to be a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name for an Aronszajn tree at $\kappa_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$. Thus, they have a separation pair below the height of the tree. Since we always pick the minimal witness - it must be below $\kappa_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$. By the inaccessibility of κ, there is a large set of coordinates in which the separating pairs are the same. Assume, without loss of generality, that this is the case to begin with. We further assume that below the supermum of the ordinals $\kappa_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$, the names for the branches

are fixed and if a name for a branch $\dot{\theta}$ of height $< \kappa_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$ appears in the domain of a condition with some self generic r, then it appears in the condition also together with a self generic condition r' such that $r' \geq r$ and $\mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}\, r') \cap \kappa \leq \sup_{\beta,\xi,\xi'} \kappa_{\beta,\xi,\xi'}$.

Let us show that for all $\eta' < \eta''$, $p'_{\eta'}$ is compatible with $p''_{\eta''}$. Indeed, $q = p'_{\eta'} \cup p''_{\eta''}$ is a condition. The proof is the same as the proof of 2.10: We show, by induction on $\gamma < \alpha$, that $q \restriction \gamma$ is a condition. The limit case is clear, so let us focus in the successor case. $q(\gamma) = p'_{\eta'}(\gamma) \cup p''_{\eta''}(\gamma)$. Assume that $(r', \dot{\theta}') \in \mathrm{dom}\, p'_{\eta'}(\gamma), (r'', \dot{\theta}'') \in \mathrm{dom}\, p''_{\eta''}(\gamma)$. We want to show that the compatibility condition in Definition 3.3 holds. If $r' \perp r''$, then condition (a) holds. Otherwise, without loss of generality, $r' \leq r''$. Therefore, they share the weakest self generic condition, and the separating witnesses. So either the heights of $\dot{\theta}', \dot{\theta}''$ are below the height of the weakest self generic condition, and then $(s, \theta'') \in p'_{\eta'}$, and we get the compatibility. Otherwise, their height is above the height of the weakest self generic condition, then by the definition of separation pair, $(p''_{\eta''} \cup p'_{\eta'}) \restriction \gamma$ forces that $\dot{\theta}', \dot{\theta}''$ are incompatible. □

The above construction allows us to get indestructibility of the Special Aronszajn Tree Property relative to closed forcing from the ground model. We will want to apply it on other specialization forcing notions:

Lemma 3.9. *There is a projection from* $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda)$ *onto* $\mathbb{P}$.

Proof. For each $\alpha < \lambda$ let $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ be the class of all $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-names for members of $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ ordered by $\tau \leq_{\mathbb{T}_\alpha} \sigma$ iff $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$ "$\tau \leq_{\dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha} \sigma$". We may note that $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ is μ-closed of size less than λ, since each iterate in the iteration $\mathbb{P}$ is μ-closed and has cardinality less than λ and the forcing $\mathbb{P}$ is κ-c.c. Let $\mathbb{T}$ be the μ-support product of $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$'s, $\alpha < \lambda$. Then

- There is a projection from $\mathbb{T}$ onto $\mathbb{P}$.
- For each $\alpha < \lambda$, there is a projection from $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda)$ onto $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$. This is because $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ is μ-closed and of size less than λ.
- There is a projection from $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda)$ to $\prod^{\mu-\mathrm{support}}_{\alpha<\lambda} \mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda)$. To see this, let $\langle S_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be a partition of λ into sets of size λ. Then it is easily seen that:
  - There is a projection from $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda)$ to $\prod^{\mu-\mathrm{support}}_{\alpha<\lambda} \mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda) \restriction S_\alpha$, where $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda) \restriction S_\alpha = \{p \in \mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda) \mid \mathrm{dom}(p) \subseteq \mu \times S_\alpha\}$.

– $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, <\lambda) \restriction S_\alpha \simeq \mathrm{Col}(\mu, <\lambda)$.

From these, the result follows immediately.

It follows that there is a sequence of projections as follows:

$$\mathrm{Col}(\mu, <\lambda) \to \prod_{\alpha<\lambda}^{\mu-\text{support}} \mathrm{Col}(\mu, <\lambda) \to \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{P}.$$

So there is a projection from $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, <\lambda)$ onto $\mathbb{P}$, as required. □

To conclude the proof we need the following elementary facts:

Lemma 3.10. *Assume that $\iota\colon \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is a κ-complete projection and assume that $\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{Q}$ are κ-closed. Let $H \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ be a generic filter. The quotient forcing $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{P}/H = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \iota(p) \in H\}$ is κ-closed in $V[H]$.*

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose $T \in V$ is a κ-Aronszajn tree. If T is special in a generic extension by a κ-closed forcing notion, then T is already special in V.*

Proof. Assume that $\dot{f}$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-name for a specialization function for the tree T, and assume that $\mathbb{R}$ is κ-closed. Since T is a κ-tree, $|T| = \kappa$. Let $\langle r_i \mid i < \kappa\rangle$ be a decreasing sequence of conditions in $\mathbb{R}$, r_i decides the value of $\dot{f}$ on the i-th element in the tree T. Let $\tilde{f}$ be the obtained function. It is clear that $\tilde{f}$ is a specialization function. □

Note that in the previous section, we did not need to know anything about the forcing notion $\mathbb{B}$, except its chain condition property. Thus we can generalize the construction of the previous section and combine it with the above methods to get the following.

Definition 3.12. *Let $\lambda > \kappa = \mu^+ > \mu$ be regular cardinals, κ indestructible supercompact. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be a μ-c.c. forcing notion of size $\leq \lambda$ and let $\dot{T}$ be a $\mathbb{C} \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)$-name for a κ-Aronszajn tree.*

We define the forcing $\mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathbb{C}\times\mathrm{Col}(\kappa,<\lambda)}(\dot{T})$. A condition p in the forcing is a partial function with domain $< \mu$ such that:

(1) *If $(r, \dot{\theta}) \in \operatorname{dom} p$ then r is $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)$-self generic, and r forces $\dot{\theta}$ to be a bounded branch in the tree $\dot{T}$.*

(2) $\operatorname{range} f \subseteq \mu$.

(3) *(Compatibility condition) If $(r, \dot{\theta}), (r', \dot{\theta}') \in p^{-1}(\xi)$ then one of the following holds:*

- $r \perp r'$
- $r \cup r' \Vdash \dot{\theta}$ *is incompatible with* $\dot{\theta}'$.
- $r \cup r' \Vdash \dot{\theta} = \dot{\theta}'$.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\mu < \kappa < \lambda$ be regular cardinals. Assume that κ is indestructible supercompact and assume that*

$$\mathbb{Q} = \langle \langle \mathbb{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle, \langle \dot{\mathbb{R}}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda \rangle \rangle$$

is a μ-c.c. iteration of length λ. Then there is a μ-closed κ-c.c. forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ of size λ, making $\kappa = \mu^+$ which forces $\mathrm{SATP}(\kappa)$. *Further this fact is indestructible by $\mathbb{Q} \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$; and indeed, the forcing $\mathbb{P}$ specializes all $\mathbb{Q} \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, < \lambda)$-names of κ-Aronszajn trees.*

Proof. In this case we iterate to specialize all $\mathbb{Q} \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)$-names for κ-Aronszajn trees. The first step of the forcing is $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, <\kappa)$. At the α-th step of the forcing, for $0 < \alpha$, we pick a $\mathbb{P}_\alpha \times \mathbb{Q} \restriction \alpha \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)$-name for a κ-Aronszajn tree, $\dot{T}_\alpha$, and force with $\mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda)}_{\mathbb{Q} \restriction \alpha}(\dot{T}_\alpha)$. The support of the iteration is $< \mu$. Using the κ-c.c. of the forcing $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$, we can make sure that every name for a κ-Aronszajn tree is specialized.

In order to show that this forcing still has the κ.c.c., we need the following separation claim, which is a generalization of Claim 3.8.

Claim 3.14. *Assume $\alpha < \lambda$ and $p, q \in \mathbb{P}_\alpha$. Let r be a $(\mathbb{P}_\alpha, \mathbb{Q}_\alpha, \mathrm{Col}(\kappa, <\lambda), \dot{T}_\alpha)$-self generic condition and let $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Sk}(\mathrm{range}(r))$. Let $\dot{\theta}, \dot{\tau}$ be $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$-names for branches in $\dot{T}_\alpha$ with length at least $\mathcal{A} \cap \kappa = \kappa_r$.*

If $p \cap \mathcal{A} = q \cap \mathcal{A}$ then, there are conditions p', q' and a sequence $\langle (b_i, \theta'_i, \tau'_i) \mid i < \bar{\mu} < \mu \rangle$ such that:

(1) *$p' \leq_\alpha p$, $q' \leq_\alpha q$, $p' \cap \mathcal{A} = q' \cap \mathcal{A}$.*
(2) *$b_i \in \mathbb{B}$.*
(3) *θ'_i, τ'_i are elements of $\dot{T}_\alpha$ below level κ_r, $\tau'_i \neq \theta'_i$.*
(4) *$(b_i, p', r) \Vdash \tau'_i \in \dot{\tau}$, $(b_i, q', r) \Vdash \theta'_i \in \dot{\theta}$.*
(5) *$\{b_i \mid i < \bar{\mu}\}$ is a maximal antichain in $\mathbb{B}$.*

The rest of the proof is as in 3.7. □

The next lemma can be proved as in 3.9

Lemma 3.15. *There is a projection from* $\mathrm{Col}(\mu, < \lambda)$ *onto* $\mathbb{P}$.

3.2. **Completing the proof of 1.3.** Finally in this section we complete the proof of 1.3.

Assume $\aleph_0 = \kappa_0 < \kappa_1 < \cdots < \kappa_n < \cdots < \lambda$, where each $\kappa_n, 0 < n < \omega$, is supercompact and λ is κ_n-closed for all $n < \omega$ with $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$. We also assume that each κ_n is Laver indestructible under κ_n-directed closed forcing notions. We define the forcing notions $\mathbb{P}_n, n < \omega$, by induction on n as follows.

- $\mathbb{P}_0$ is the forcing for collapsing κ_1 to be the successor of κ_0 and specializing all κ_1 trees in a way indestructible by $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_1, < \lambda)$.
- For $n > 1$, $\mathbb{P}_n$ is the forcing (in the ground model) for collapsing κ_n to be the successor of κ_{n-1}, and specializing all $\mathbb{P}_0 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}_{n-1}$-names for κ_n-Aronszajn trees, in a way which is indestructible under $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_n, < \lambda)$.

By 3.13, the following holds.

Claim 3.16. *let* $n < \omega$.

(a) $\mathbb{P}_n$ *is* κ_n*-closed and* κ_{n+1}*-c.c.*

(b) $\mathbb{P}_n \Vdash$ "$\kappa_{n+1} = \kappa_n^+$ *and* $2^{\kappa_n} = \lambda$".

(c) $\mathbb{P}_n \Vdash$ "$\mathrm{SATP}(\kappa_{n+1})$". *Further this fact is indestructible by* $\prod_{m<n} \mathbb{P}_m \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n+1}, < \lambda)$ *and indeed, the forcing* $\mathbb{P}_n$ *specializes all* $\prod_{m<n} \mathbb{P}_m \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n+1}, < \lambda)$*-names of* κ_{n+1}*-Aronszajn trees.*

Finally let $\mathbb{P} = \prod_{n<\omega} \mathbb{P}_n$, be the full-support product of $\mathbb{P}_n$'s, $n < \omega$ and let $G = \prod_{n<\omega} G_n$ be $\mathbb{P}$-generic over V. We show that In the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}, \mathrm{SATP}(\aleph_n)$ holds for all $n < \omega$.

Claim 3.17. (a) *For each* $n < \omega, \aleph_n^{V[G]} = \kappa_n$.

(b) *If* $P^{V[G]}(\kappa_n) = P^{V[G\restriction n+1]}(\kappa_n)$, *where* $G \restriction n+1 = \prod_{m<n+1} G_m$ *is* $\prod_{m<n+1} \mathbb{P}_m$*-generic over* V.

The next claim can be proved easily by induction on n and using 3.15.

Claim 3.18. *For each* $n < \omega$, *there is a projection from* $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_n, < \lambda)$ *onto* $\mathbb{P}_n$.

Now fix $n < \omega$. By our 3.16, $V[G_n] \models \mathrm{SATP}(\kappa_{n+1})$ and $\mathrm{SATP}(\kappa_{n+1})$ continues to hold in the generic extension of $V[G_n]$ by $\prod_{m<n} \mathbb{P}_m \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n+1}, < \lambda)$.

Now suppose T is a κ_{n+1}-Aronszajn tree in $V[G]$. By 3.16(b), T is in $V[\prod_{m\leq n+1} G_m] = V[G_n][\prod_{m<n} G_m][G_{n+1}]$. By 3.18, we have a projection

$$\pi : \prod_{m<n} \mathbb{P}_n \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n+1}, < \lambda) \to \prod_{m<n} \mathbb{P}_n \times \mathbb{P}_{n+1},$$

so we can take a $\prod_{m<n} \mathbb{P}_n \times \mathrm{Col}(\kappa_{n+1}, < \lambda)$-name $\dot{T}$ for it in $V[G_n]$. By 3.16(c), forcing with $\mathbb{P}_n$ adds a specialization function for $\dot{T}$, and so T is specialized. □

4. Special Aronszajn Tree Property at successor of every regular cardinal

In this section we prove 1.4. Recall from Section 3 that, for an increasing sequence $\kappa_1 < \cdots < \kappa_n < \ldots$ of indestructible supercompact cardinals, there exists a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}(0, \langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle)$ of size $(\sup_{n<\omega} \kappa_n)^+$ which forces Special Aronszajn Tree Property at all $\aleph_n$'s $n < \omega$. We now state a generalization of this forcing that works for higher cardinals.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume α is a limit ordinal and $\kappa_1 < \cdots < \kappa_n < \ldots$ are indestructible supercompact cardinals above $\aleph_\alpha$. Then there is an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$-closed forcing notion $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, \langle \kappa_n \mid 1 < n < \omega \rangle)$ of size $\lambda = 2^{(\sup_{n<\omega} \kappa_n)^+}$ such that the following hold in a generic extension by $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, \langle \kappa_n \mid 1 < n < \omega \rangle)$:*

(a) *For each $1 < n < \omega, \aleph_{\alpha+n} = \kappa_n$ and $\lambda = \aleph_{\alpha+\omega+1}$.*

(b) $\forall\ 1 \leq n < \omega,\ 2^{\aleph_{\alpha+n}} = \lambda$.

(c) *Special Aronszajn Tree Property holds at all $\aleph_{\alpha+n}$'s, $1 < n < \omega$.*

Proof. Define, by induction on $n < \omega$, the forcing notions $\mathbb{P}_n$ as follows (see Lemma 3.13):

- $\mathbb{P}_0$ is the forcing for collapsing κ_0 to be the successor of $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, and specialize every κ_0-tree in an indestructible way relative to $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_0, <\lambda)$.
- For $n > 0$, $\mathbb{P}_n$ is the forcing for collapsing κ_n to be the successor of κ_{n-1}, and specialize every $\prod_{m<n} \mathbb{P}_m$-name for a κ_n-Aronszajn tree in an indestructible way relative to $\mathrm{Col}(\kappa_n, <\lambda)$.

Finally set $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, \langle \kappa_n \mid 1 < n < \omega \rangle) = \prod_{n<\omega} \mathbb{P}_n \times \mathrm{Col}((\sup_{n<\omega} \kappa_n)^+, \lambda)$ be the full-support product of $\mathbb{P}_n$'s, $n < \omega$, followed by collapsing λ to be of cardinality the successor of the limit of the κ_n-s.

The forcing notion $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, \langle \kappa_n \mid 1 < n < \omega \rangle)$ is easily seen to be $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$-closed and of size λ. The same proof as in the proof of 1.3 shows that clauses (a), (b) and (c) are satisfied. □

We also need the following lemma which is essentially due to Laver [4].

Lemma 4.2. *Assume η is a regular cardinal and $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ is an increasing sequence of supercompact cardinals above η. Then there exists an η-directed closed forcing notion $\mathbb{L}(\eta, \langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle)$ which makes the supercompactness of each κ_n indestructible under κ_n-directed closed forcing notion.*

Now suppose that $\langle \kappa_\xi \mid 0 < \xi \in ON \rangle$ is an increasing and continuous sequence of supercompact cardinals and their limits and set $\kappa_0 = \aleph_0$. We can assume that no limit point of the sequence is an inaccessible cardinal. Let

$$\langle \langle \mathbb{P}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in ON, \alpha = 0 \text{ or } \lim(\alpha) \rangle, \langle \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in ON, \alpha = 0 \text{ or } \lim(\alpha) \rangle \rangle$$

be the reverse Easton iteration such that

(1) $\mathbb{P}_0 = \{1_{\mathbb{P}_0}\}$ is the trivial forcing.

(2) $V^{\mathbb{P}_0} \models$ "$\mathbb{Q}_0 = \mathbb{L}(\aleph_1, \langle \kappa_n \mid 0 < n < \omega \rangle) * \dot{\mathbb{P}}(0, \langle \kappa_n \mid 0 < n < \omega \rangle)$.

(3) For each limit ordinal $\alpha > 0$,

$$V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha} \models \text{"}\mathbb{Q}_\alpha = \mathbb{L}(\kappa_\alpha^+, \langle \kappa_{\alpha+n} \mid 0 < n < \omega \rangle) * \dot{\mathbb{P}}(\alpha, \langle \kappa_{\alpha+n} \mid 0 < n < \omega \rangle)\text{"}.$$

Note that at each step α, the forcing notion $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ has size less than $\kappa_{\alpha+1}$, so cardinals $\kappa_{\alpha+n}, 0 < n < \omega$, remain supercompact in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ and so the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}_\alpha$ is well-defined in $V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha}$.

Finally let $\mathbb{P}$ be the direct limit of the above forcing construction and let G be $\mathbb{P}$-generic over V.

Lemma 4.3. *The following hold in $V[G]$:*

(a) $\forall \xi \in ON, \aleph_\xi = \kappa_\xi$.

(b) *For each limit ordinal α and each $1 < n < \omega$, $2^{\aleph_{\alpha+n}} = \kappa_{\alpha+\omega+1} = \aleph_{\alpha+\omega+1}$.*

Let's show that in the generic extension by $\mathbb{P}$, Special Aronszajn Tree Property holds at successor of every regular cardinal. Thus assume α is a limit ordinal (the case $\alpha = 0$ is similar). We can write the forcing $\mathbb{P}$ as $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{P}}_\infty$, and by 4.1,

$$V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha} \models \text{“} \bigwedge_{1<n<\omega} \mathrm{SATP}(\aleph_{\alpha+n})\text{”}.$$

But

$$V^{\mathbb{P}_\alpha * \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_\alpha} \models \text{“ } \mathbb{P}_\infty \text{ is } \kappa_{\alpha+\omega+1} - \text{closed”},$$

and so $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models$“$\bigwedge_{1<n<\omega} \mathrm{SATP}(\aleph_{\alpha+n})$”. The result follows immediately. □

We close the paper with the following question, which is an analogue of Magidor's question for tree property.

Question 4.4. *Is it consistent, relative to the existence of large cardinals, that Special Aronszajn Tree Property holds for all uncountable regular cardinals ?*

We remark that the following question is open:

Question 4.5. *Let λ be successor of a singular cardinal. Is* $\mathrm{SATP}(\lambda)$ *consistent? I.e., is it consistent that there is a λ-Aronszajn tree, and every λ-Aronszajn tree is special?*

References

[1] James Baumgartner, Jerome Malitz, and William Reinhardt, *Embedding trees in the rationals*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **67** (1970), no. 4, 1748–1753.

[2] Samuel Coskey, *Special uncountable trees*, 2016.

[3] Thomas Jech, *Set theory*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[4] Richard Laver, *Making the supercompactness of κ indestructible under κ-directed closed forcing*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **29** (1978), no. 4, 385–388.

[5] Richard Laver and Saharon Shelah, *The $\aleph_2$-souslin hypothesis*, Transections of the American Mathematical Society **264** (1981), no. 2, 411–417.

School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box: 19395-5746, Tehran-Iran.

E-mail address, M. Golshani: golshani.m@gmail.com

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, Jerusalem 91904, Israel.

E-mail address, Y. Hayut: yair.hayut@mail.huji.ac.il